REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on 06/20/2008, and the references cited therewith.

New dependent claims 26-28 have been added. Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-16 have been cancelled. These claims have not been cancelled due to the Office Action rejections or any reference identified by the Office, and Applicant reserves the right to pursue these and/or similar claims in the future (e.g., in a continuing patent application).

Examiner Interview

Applicant's representative appreciates the time taken by Jeong S. Park for the telephonic Examiner Interview conducted on August 1, 2008. The participants included Mr. Park and Steven R. Gilliam. The participants discussed claim 18 and the references, Fischer and Pessi. The participants also discussed the claim language "content topology." The participants did not reach an agreement with respect to allowability of the claims.

Claim Objections

The Office objects to "Method" as recited in claims 18-22 and 24. Applicant has amended the claims to recite "A method" in claim 18 and "The method" in claims 19-22 and 24 as requested by the Office.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2-5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fischer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,162,543; hereinafter Fischer). Claims 1, 2-5, 13 and 14 have been cancelled.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Claims 6-9, 11, 15, 18-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer and further in view of Pessi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0083291;

hereinafter Pessi). Claims 6-9, 11, and 15 have been cancelled. Applicant traverses the rejections to claims 18-22, and 24. Applicant has amended claim 18 with respect to the terms "Mobile Device specific content topology" and "dynamic information." Although the amendments were not necessary since none of the references disclosed or suggested creating a Mobile Device specific content topology, Applicant's representative amended the claim to emphasize the distinctions between claim 18 and the references in an effort to advance prosecution.

The Office Action rejects claim 18 with a combination of Fischer and Pessi, and using an excessive generalization of the claim language that essentially disregards the claim language. The rejection of claim 18 is erroneous at least because neither of Fischer nor Pessi disclose or suggest "creating a Mobile Device specific content topology based on an existing user-defined connected content topology…and dynamic information," and neither of Fischer nor Pessi disclose or suggest packaging the Mobile Device specific content topology. The Office Action argues that Pessi discloses creating and packaging a Mobile Device specific content topology, with specific reference to paragraph [0014] of Pessi. That paragraph of Pessi discloses adapting a message for use on a terminal based on terminal-related information, which includes content types accepted by the terminal and operational limits of the terminal. The Office also refers to paragraph [0068], which discloses other capability descriptors – number of audio channels, sampling rate of audio formats, and frame rate in video formats. These paragraphs of Pessi disclose an intermediate network element adapting a message to conform to the capabilities of a terminal, based on capability information and user preferences provided beforehand to the intermediate network element from the terminal. Pessi does not disclose the network element creating a portal page layout for a Mobile Device in a disconnected mode based on a portal page layout at a server. Disclosing adapting a message based on terminal capabilities does not disclose or suggest creating a Mobile Device specific content topology based on an existing user-defined connected content topology that includes disconnected Portlet applications.

The Office Action also argues that the same disclosure of an intermediate network element adapting a message sent from computer to a target terminal discloses packaging the created Mobile Device specific content topology. The Office Action cannot, without any

reasonable rationale, use disclosure of adapting a message as disclosing or suggesting both creating and packaging the Mobile Device specific content topology.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant's representative requests that the rejections be withdrawn. Neither Fischer nor Pessi, standing alone or in combination, disclose or suggest any of the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Steven R. Gilliam at 512-372-3933 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman Howard Cohen, et al.

By their Representatives,

DeLizio Gilliam, PLLC
15201 Mason Road
Suite 1000-312
Cypress, TX 77433
281-758-0025

Date 8/5/2008 By /Steven R. Gilliam, #51734/
Steven R. Gilliam
Reg. No. 51734

Date of Deposit: August 5, 2008
This paper or fee is being filed on the date indicated above using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.